

PRIORITIES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM  
OF UKRAINE: MARTIAL LAW AND RECOVERY

Valerii Vorotin  
Mykhailo Drahomanov Ukrainian State  
University  
vevorotin@gmail.com

Nataliia Vorotina  
V. M. Koretsky Institute of State and  
Law, National Academy of Sciences  
of Ukraine  
vorotinanataliia@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Introduction (Including the problem of the research)

Public administration in Ukraine is undergoing a new and complex stage of transformation and modernization under the defining influence of geostrategic changes and the conditions of martial law. It remains a key element of the effective functioning of the economic system and the main pillar of state resilience. The final restoration of the European and Euro-Atlantic course of development became a response to the aggression of the Russian Federation and ensured the strengthening of partnerships with democratic states. The system of public administration must ensure resource mobilization, effective coordination of governmental decisions, and the formation of the foundation for post-war recovery and further integration into the EU.

The aim of research

The conditions of martial law exacerbate key problems in the functioning of public administration: insufficient human and analytical capacity, institutional imbalance between regions, weak strategic planning, and the incomplete compliance of certain public authorities with EU standards. Existing mechanisms and instruments of public administration do not provide an adequate response to current challenges, which requires substantial renewal, reorientation of the system, and a clear definition of new priorities for public administration in Ukraine’s economic system under martial law and in the context of subsequent recovery.

Objectives

To identify the key priorities for the development of public administration in Ukraine under wartime conditions and to assess their impact on post-war recovery and integration into the European economic and administrative space. To summarize the structural changes in public administration during wartime; to assess the role of theoretical laws and regularities of administration; to identify the European integration prerequisites for the development of administrative institutions; and to formulate a system of priorities for post-war modernization and recovery.

The methods of the research

Public administration is based on a system of objective theoretical laws that define stable relationships between the subject and object of administration and ensure the integrity of economic and administrative processes. These laws include: – unity of the administrative system;

– proportionality between the subject and object; – combination of centralization and decentralization; – correlation between the controlling and controlled systems; and others.

Regularities of public administration reflect tendencies in the development and functioning of administrative processes in specific historical situations, particularly under martial law. These principles form the logic of public authority activity, institutional resilience, and the capacity to operate under crisis conditions.

Theoretical background

Modern priorities in the field of public administration are directed toward new resource opportunities and the renewal of mechanisms and instruments necessary for significantly strengthening the capacity of state and local authorities responsible for the restoration of territories after Ukraine’s Victory over the Russian Federation. The current state of public authorities, especially their personnel, demonstrates substantial reserves for improving and potentially significantly upgrading the level of professional competence.

Profound transformations occurring in the national economy are accompanied by major institutional changes in the system of public administration, particularly concerning the vision of state-building after Victory. Martial law shapes a special and unique model of governance at the state and regional levels. The further development of market relations within the national economic system, including strong regions and subregions, constitutes the strategic course of the decentralized system of public administration. In this system, the role of effective public, regional, and local governance not only does not diminish but, on the contrary, increases, acquiring new quality and effectiveness under real threats to national survival.

The formation of new economic and administrative systems and institutions in new geostrategic realities remains necessary under the complex conditions of martial law. The vision of Ukraine’s European future, effective and cohesive public administration is not merely a slogan but a reality and a key requirement for Victory. This confirms the non-alternative nature of advancing governance reforms towards the development of a nation of self-governing communities as the optimal model of democratic and free governance in a post-war European state.

Any science is characterized by its inherent theoretical laws and regularities. The science of public administration also contains such laws and regularities. Objective administrative laws, unlike state (legal) laws that regulate social relations, describe essential, necessary, and recurring general forms of interaction between the administering subject and the administered object, as well as between the system of administration and the social environment.

These laws express the necessity and universality of those aspects and elements of administrative activity and relationships that historically arise, consolidate, and are reproduced in the structure and functions of administration.

Regular (law-conditioned) structural and functional relationships do not operate with deterministic certainty; they are realized as tendencies that manifest through numerous concrete phenomena and circumstances, individual behaviors and actions, governed by probabilistic “rules of the game.” The implementation of laws depends on many conditions (variables), above all on the administering subject, their knowledge and abilities, and also on the administered object.

Main findings

The results of the study confirm that under the conditions of martial law, public administration performs a key and multidimensional function in ensuring national resilience, adaptability, and the manageability of societal processes (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). The challenges generated by the full-scale aggression of the Russian Federation have necessitated the development of new mechanisms of rapid response, the strengthening of crisis-management systems, improved interagency coordination, and the introduction of comprehensive security-governance instruments (Boin et al., 2016). These transformations underscore the importance of institutional continuity, risk management and strategic foresight, which have become crucial elements of the national governance architecture.

At the same time, the role of local and regional governance has significantly increased, as communities and regions serve as primary actors responsible for post-war recovery, reconstruction of infrastructure and the provision of essential public services (Shaw, Sasse & Hughes, 2019). The decentralisation reform demonstrated resilience under crisis conditions, yet requires further consolidation through enhanced human-resource capacity, financial autonomy, and the adoption of strategic and evidence-based decision-making tools.

European integration is emerging as a decisive driver of governance transformation, as the public-administration reform constitutes a core requirement for Ukraine’s EU accession process (OECD, 2023). This includes strengthening transparency and accountability mechanisms, the professionalization of the civil service, the adoption of European administrative standards, and the expansion of digital tools and electronic governance, which proved particularly effective during wartime and remain essential for reconstruction and modernization.

Ukraine’s post-war development will be shaped by long-term strategic priorities, including the reconstruction of critical infrastructure, development of human capital, institutionalization of cohesion policy, digital transformation of administrative processes and modernization of the economic system based on innovation, resilience and sustainability (European Commission, 2024). Public administration must function as the coordinating centre ensuring the integration of these priorities within a unified national recovery framework.

Ukraine’s accession to the European Union has the potential to strengthen Europe’s economic, political and security capacity. Integration of Ukraine could also act as a catalyst for modernizing governance practices within the EU itself, enhancing regional cohesion, crisis resilience and the overall strategic posture of the Union (Laffan, Mendes & Tatham, 2022). Consequently, the Ukrainian model of public administration - shaped under the pressure of war-may contribute valuable practical solutions to the broader European governance space.

MAIN RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Public administration, together with its component-local self-government - serves as a key strategic resource for achieving Ukraine’s Victory and post-war modernization, as its institutional capacity determines the ability of the state to operate effectively in crisis conditions and ensure sustainable socio-economic development.

Adherence to the fundamental laws of administration ensures balanced administrative interactions and the stability of the economic system. European integration is a non-alternative direction of transformation, as the adoption of European standards of transparency, professionalization, and accountability strengthens institutions and accelerates progress in accession negotiations.

The further development of the public administration system requires renewal of the personnel corps, strengthening regional capacity, implementing evidence-based policymaking, institutional and digital modernization, and reinforcing local governance capable of ensuring the resilience and competitiveness of communities.

References

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/public-management-reform-9780198779374>  
Boin, A., ’t Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2016). *The Politics of Crisis Management*. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/politics-of-crisis-management/0A1CB8A64584FF2B245A76F5C1CCAE3A>  
Shaw, J., Sasse, G., & Hughes, J. (2019). *Governance in Post-Conflict Societies*. <https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/usd/governance-in-post-conflict-societies-9781788112658.html>  
OECD. (2023). *Towards a New Public Governance in Ukraine*. <https://www.oecd.org/governance/ukraine-governance-review.htm>  
European Commission. (2024). *EU Support for Ukraine’s Recovery and Modernisation*. [https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/ukraine\\_en](https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/ukraine_en)  
Laffan, K., Mendes, J., & Tatham, M. (2022). *The Future of European Integration*. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Future-of-European-Integration/Laffan-Mendes-Tatham/p/book/9781032128548>